

4-8-2019

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 8, 2019

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2019 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 8, 2019" (2019). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1255.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1255

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4/08/19 (3:30 – 4:56)
Mtg. #1823
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

No members of the Press were present.

Guests: David **Grant**, Hannah **Gregor**, Taryn **Kroymann**, Chris **Martin**, Amy **Staples**, Jennifer **Waldron**, Brenna **Wolfe**.

Courtesy Announcements:

President **Nook** reported positive feelings from team members attending the Higher Learning Commission’s annual meeting, noting that while the team has some editing to do, it is ahead of schedule. **Nook** reported that UNI won the Diversity and Inclusion Award for large employers from the Grow Cedar Valley group. (See pages 4-6)

Faculty Chair **Cutter** invites faculty feedback about new departmental standards for faculty evaluation. Also, she notes there is broad support for adding a large portion of non-tenure track faculty to voting faculty at UNI, as indicated by recent survey results. (See page 6)

United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker** reported that there is some conflict over issues in the Faculty Handbook, and that faculty should prepare to provide “thoughtful and assertive feedback” on that forthcoming lengthy document. (See page 7)

Faculty Handbook Consultation will be a major topic at the April 22 meeting, according to Senate Chair **Petersen**. She invited current and new Senators to attend a New Senator Orientation on Monday, April 29. Current Senators should consider running for Senate Vice-Chair, which will be chosen at the next meeting. (See pages 7-9)

Kristen **Ahart** reported on NISG activities: A meeting with Mark **Braun** of the Board of Regents, students to be trained as advisors in the conduct process, and

the acceptance by Residence Hall Directors of diversity initiatives and the Jumpstart Living Learning program to support students. (See pages 9-10)

Minutes for Approval: March 25, 2018

**** (Stafford/Skaar)** Passed. One abstention.

Committee Reports: Committee on Committees Annual Report (See pages 10-15)

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

**** (Burnight/Strauss)** Bundled for April 22nd Docket.

1412 Faculty Handbook Consultation

1453 [Emeritus request for Christopher Edginton](#)

1454 [Emeritus request for Carol Weisenberger](#)

Consideration of Docket Items

1327 1448 [Effort Certification Guidance and Procedure Update](#) (See pages 15-18)

1328 1449 [Consultation on Department Head Assessment by Faculty Committee Recommendations](#) (See pages 18-25)

1329 1450 [Cancellation Policy 4.07 Proposal](#)

**** (Burnight/Skaar)** Motion to refer to EPC for revision. (See pages 25-39)

1330 1451 [Committee on Committee Recommendation to Discharge Writing Committee](#)

**** (Strauss/Hesse)** Motion passed; three opposed; one abstention.
(See pages 40-45)

1331 1452 [Emeritus Request for Mary Christ](#)

**** (Strauss/Skaar)** Motion passed. All aye. (See pages 45-46)

No New Business

Adjournment: (Strauss/Acclamation) 4:56 p.m.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, April 22, 2019

Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 46 pages and 0 addendum follows.

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 8th, 2019

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Gloria **Stafford**, Sara **Smith**, and Shahram **Varzavand**. **Also Present:** NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook** and Associate Provost John **Vallentine**.

Not Present: Senators Cathy **DeSoto**, Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease** and Provost Jim **Wohlpart**.

Guests: David **Grant**, Hannah **Gregor**, Taryn **Kroymann**, Chris **Martin**, Amy **Staples**, Jennifer **Waldron**, Brenna **Wolfe**.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Petersen: Let me call the meeting to order. We begin by asking—I don’t see any press in the room, so let me invite our guests to introduce themselves and the issue or the topic; the reason they are joining us today.

Wolfe: Hi, I’m Brenna **Wolfe**. I’m a senior and I’m here to listen to the presentation of these two.

Gregor: I'm Hanna **Gregor**. I'm a senior and I'm giving a presentation on the Policy 4.07 on Weather Cancellation policies.

Kroymann: I'm Taryn and I'm also a senior.

Waldron: Jennifer **Waldron**; I'm the Assistant Vice President of Research Innovation in the Graduate College, and I'm here to report back about the Effort Certification.

Martin: Chris **Martin**, Communication Studies. I'm just here watching.

Grant: David **Grant**, Languages & Literatures. I'm also just here watching.

Petersen: Welcome and thank you all for attending. Let us begin with our announcements and I'll begin with President **Nook**.

Nook: Thank you. Provost **Wohlpart** is out of town, so I'll make a couple of remarks that are kind of for both of us. The HLC Conference; the annual HLC Conference is going on right now in Chicago and so the team went over on Friday of last week and they're all due back tomorrow and had a chance to meet with them. I got there late Friday and stayed all day Saturday. They've got a Saturday program just for presidents. So, Saturday night I got together with the team and they talked about what they had heard that day, and most of this was about where you should be, and what you should prep in each of the criteria areas. Each of the criteria chairs was out meeting with people doing the same thing and getting updates on what they should be doing and where they should be at. And everybody came back feeling like One: We got some really good information. We got some things we know we need to work on, but we're way ahead of the game.

We're about a year ahead of where we need to be at this time, which is good. It will allow us to prep some of the writing. The biggest thing they need to do right now is do some editing. They've got the drafts for each of the criteria put together. Some of those are 21-25 pages and they've got to get them down to two or three. So it's serious editing that has to be done. And I think a lot of what they put in these papers, from what they were saying is stuff that will go into the evidence side and so it will be a matter of writing this so it is sleek, but then points to these evidence pieces in a good way. They were all feeling very good about where things were at and how they were moving in this process. So everything was going really well. We've got about 12-15 people there for this getting things pulled into shape and ready to go for that.

I just want to mention that a couple of weeks ago, just over a week or so ago, they had the annual meeting of what is now called "Grow Cedar Valley." There used to be this Chamber entity called the Greater Cedar Valley Alliance and Chamber. They have rebranded and changed their name. Their new name is Grow Cedar Valley, and at their meeting they unveiled their new logo and everything and there's clearly some new enthusiasm in the organization. They've had a leadership change; that sort of thing. But then UNI received the Diversity & Inclusion Award for large employers at that. It's kind of a long process to apply for this and things, but a lot of it has to do with things we've put in place over the last few years that put us in a place to enrich diversity and to be able to be more inclusive in that diversity. It's not just to get enough faculty and staff of diverse backgrounds in a diverse way, but then to find ways to make sure that those faculty and students have an equitable chance to be successful and supported

when they're here. So, it was really a recognition of some of those steps that we as a University have taken. It was a really nice event and well-attended. Great to be recognized for the steps that we've taken and we made it very clear that these are steps and this isn't a process that will end at any time. It's going to continue, and as a public university from time to time we will make mistakes and they will be very public, and we just need to be used to that. Not necessarily comfortable with it, but know that we're going to have to deal with those from time to time. We made that as part of our public statement, too. It's a good event. That's all I have.

Petersen: Thank you, President **Nook**.

Nook: You bet.

Petersen: Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

Cutter: Thank you. So I just have two comments. The first thing is to say that I know that at this point in time departments have submitted their new departmental standards for faculty evaluation procedure and I know in our college, we've gotten feedback back from the CRC and the deans. I'm assuming that's happened elsewhere. I just wanted to invite you all as Faculty Chair I'm on the Faculty Handbook Committee—so if there's any feedback anyone is interested in providing me, I'd be happy to hear because this process has never happened before. So, just to get a sense of how things are going. So feel free to talk to me, drop me an email, give me a call.

Second, just a quick update on the Voting Rights proposal. As I mentioned before you got your survey. The survey results were that 76.5% of faculty responding

said that they were ‘somewhat’ or ‘very likely’ to support new language expanding faculty voting rights to renewable term, term, and a portion of adjuncts—adjuncts who had been here for a certain amount of time. We also got some substantive feedback on the proposal, so the committee is currently working on the next steps; final revisions and will send an email out on that shortly, but I just wanted you all to know that overall the results indicate that there is a broad level of support for adding a large portion of non-tenure track faculty to voting faculty here at UNI. That’s all I have.

Petersen: Thank you, Chair **Cutter**. United Faculty President **Hawbaker**?

Hawbaker: Last call to rsvp for the Faculty Dinner on Saturday. We have a really nice group of people that are coming. It’s going to be a really fun event, so I encourage you to come. Second, and Amy (**Petersen**) you may be addressing this in your comments as well, but soon the Senate will be asked to consult on some of the changes to the Faculty Handbook, and all of us who are on the Handbook are not quite sure how a couple of things are going to fall out because there are some issues that we have some conflict on. And so I want to prepare you that it’s going to be a pretty lengthy document and I want to prepare you for your thoughtful and assertive feedback.

Petersen: Thank you. What I can add to that is the Faculty Handbook Consultation will take place at our last Senate meeting on the 22nd. What I plan to do prior to that meeting as I do with all of our meetings, is try to prepare you by pulling out those items that we feel you should pay some attention to; to help you just focus on what might be important or controversial or germane to the Handbook and

the revisions that we have done. So, we'll have that consultation on the 22nd, and I anticipate that we will have a great deal of discussion that should take up the majority of our time. Other announcements that I have: As many of you received an email from me, we are hosting a New Senator Orientation on April 29th. That is a Monday. Jim (**Mattingly**), and I and Gretchen (**Gould**)—we've been working all year to put some infrastructures in place so that as a Senate we can be meaningfully engaged and well-prepared and informed around whatever issues might come our way. And so one of the things that we have been working on doing is crafting a new Senate Orientation to help Senators understand what we do here at the Senate; what your roles and responsibilities are, and so I wanted to also invite all of you to attend. Of course you are not a new Senator, but if you are interested and would like to attend, I very much welcome you to do so on the 29th, but please do rsvp so we know how to prepare. We will be sharing a revised Faculty Senate Handbook. There was a handbook in place quite some time ago. It has not been used or revised in a number of years and we've been working on that revision and so we plan to share that on April 29th with our new Senators, and of course I will share it with all of you, even if you do not attend on the 29th.

The other announcement I have: On April 22nd, at our last meeting we will be electing a new Vice-Chair, and so I want all of you to consider if you might be willing to step up and serve in the role of Vice-Chair, which also becomes a Chair position. If you're interested in knowing more about the position; what the roles and responsibilities look like, Jim (**Mattingly**) and I have worked to craft job descriptions for each of the Senate leadership positions. We'd be happy to share those with you, and also answer any questions or have any additional

conversation. So, please do consider stepping up and let me know if I can help you about thinking that through at all. Kristin (**Ahart**) do you have any announcements on behalf of students?

Ahart: Yes. We have a few exciting updates that have happened in the past couple of weeks from Student Government. So for the past year, our Director of Diversity is working tirelessly to ensure that we can have a Jumpstart Living Learning Community in the Residence Halls here as a continuation of our Jumpstart Program to further support those students and we're happy that that proposal has been accepted by the Department of Residence and so we're really happy about that moving forward and we also have a second LLC, that our Lower Cabinet Director of LGBT Affairs has been working on, which is the LGBT LLC, which will also be implemented. It has been accepted by the DOR for this upcoming years so we are very excited about the work that our Lower Cabinet Director as well as Director of Diversity has made on those initiatives, and we're happy to see the way that that all continues to support students on campus. We have also created a further bond with the Dean of Students to have advisor training for all of justices in the Supreme Court, so they can serve as student advisors through the conduct process, if a student so chooses to have a student advise them. We do have around eight or so faculty and staff who are trained throughout this process. But we had a lot of feedback from students that they would be really grateful if they could have a student that was also trained for that process that can better relate to maybe the situation that they're in. And so we have established that relationship and look forward to what that training will do for our students moving forward throughout the years. Finally, we had a meeting

with Executive Director Mark **Braun** of the Board of Regents and we had a good conversation about what the relationship of NISG and the Board should look like moving forward, having established hopefully a better plan to continue the progress that we've made with our Regent shadows to be a more continuous and annual event moving forward. So we're excited.

Petersen: Excellent Kristin (**Ahart**).

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: The minutes for March 25th have been disseminated. Is there a motion to approve the minutes from March 25th? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Is there any discussion needed regarding these minutes? All in favor of approving the minutes from March 25th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstentions? Andrew **Stollenwerk** is an abstention. Thank you. The motion passes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Petersen: We do have one Committee Report today and that is the Committee on Committees annual report. So I will turn it over to Jim (**Mattingly**) to share about the work of this committee.

Mattingly: All of the Committee's main work this year was to organize and hold the annual elections for faculty committees. All of those are complete. The last elections to be held are for the Vice-Chair's position in the Faculty Senate, and then also all of the College Senates have yet to select their Senate Chairs. I will file an amended report with Amy (**Petersen**) once those are done. We had a few

recommendations. The recommendations really are—they are just an accumulation of various things that I have heard from the Committee on Committees members and from other constituents; other faculty members and administrators on campus over the year. So, these were passed through the Committee on Committees last week and just in time to make the April 1st deadline to file this report. The recommendations that we had regarding committee changes were that faculty members on the Program Vitality Committee should be elected by the faculty, not chosen by deans. The charge of every committee must be reviewed for potential revision or discharge; that the committee reporting template and schedule should be established to facilitate annual review; that term limits should be considered for all committees, and then the final one—and you all have seen all of these through Amy's (**Petersen**) preview this week, that the committee recommended a change to the Faculty Constitution to include the Chair of the Faculty in the Faculty Senate leadership succession potentially. Before we voted on discharging the Writing Committee, and that's included in the Annual Report, we reported some procedural changes that were made throughout the year that were relatively minor that you've probably read in the report. I'll just briefly summarize them: We designed the database of faculty offices (which actually took a great deal of work as you might imagine), we instituted the electronic voting system across all colleges this year, which made the annual elections go a whole lot smoother I would say. So that was helpful. And then also we changed—there were just a couple of committees that were not on three year terms. We changed those to be on three-year terms—the Faculty Budget Committee, and the Faculty Committee for

Readmission and Retention. So now they're all on three-year terms, and those were the main activities of the Committee.

Petersen: Our task here today with this annual report, we have heard from the Writing Committee that is part of our agenda later on the docket, but we do have a number of recommendations. I believe what we should consider doing is asking the question as to which recommendations we may wish to explore next year and move forward with, and perhaps then put forward a motion to do so, so that the recommendations could be a part of the Senate's work immediately next fall. Since making these recommendations and sharing this report, I know there's been a number of concerns and ideas brought to bear already based on these recommendations. We certainly could have some conversation, and then perhaps make a motion to make some recommendations forward.

Mattingly: Another option I think might be to table the recommendations for next fall. I know that there was surprising little debate in the Committee on Committees over these recommendations, and so they might require a little more simmering before we put them forward. So, another option would be to table them.

Strauss: I move we table these.

Petersen: Any discussion in the motion? The motion is to table the recommendations. The motion was made first by Senator **Strauss** and second by Senator **Burnight**. Is there any discussion before we might take a vote?

Hawbaker: I wonder if the possible exception might be the recommendation for faculty members on the Program Vitality Committee to be elected by the faculty, not chosen by the deans. I think with enrollment challenges, budget challenges, I think the idea of Program Vitality--the consequences of it are becoming concerning, and I think it is important for the faculty voice to be represented by and chosen by the faculty.

Petersen: So, if I might, underlying all of these recommendations is our struggle to engage faculty to step up in service opportunities. And so with regard to the Program Vitality Committee, I believe we actually made a mistake in a round-about way. During this fall, we were missing some individuals on that committee and we struggled to find representation, and correct me if I'm wrong—and so we looked to deans and associate deans to help us to do that. Patrick (**Pease**) reported to us—do you want to share what Patrick reported?

Mattingly: Sure. Yes, Patrick (**Pease**) clarified how faculty are actually...

Nook: Is this Patrick **Pease**?

Mattingly: Yes. Thank you. Patrick clarified how faculty actually have been selected for that committee. It's actually in the charge. It says—I'll read from Patrick's note, "The PVC (Program Vitality Committee) will be a standing committee and will include six faculty selected by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Chair of the Faculty, and six administrators selected by the Provost, along with two ex-officio members: the Director of the Office of Institutional Research or a member of that office, and the Chair of the Faculty." So, that's currently the procedure for selection.

Hawbaker: So they're not chosen by the deans?

Mattingly: They are not chosen by the deans.

Petersen: But they have in a round-about way been chosen by administrators when we haven't had faculty step up. So I do think it is a good idea to table, and I think the discussion that is needed next fall is how do we ensure faculty involvement in these really important committees? And I know we've also had some comments regarding the Faculty Chair position and one of the struggles—and I'm speaking from my experience when I was Vice-Chair and charged with the Committee on Committees, it is very difficult to find people who are willing. And it's not that people are ill-intended or might not want to, but there are a lot of variables and factors that might influence a person's decision. So we need to find a solution for how can support faculty who want to step up in these service-leadership roles, so we can continue to have strong shared governance on campus.

Smith: As long as our positions are only 15% service, it's really hard. You're really stretched thin. If you're already doing service to your students, your department, to your college, there's only so much left.

Hawbaker: Well, we know that in some departments and colleges, faculty are actively discouraged from taking on University-level service, because it takes away from what the department or college wants you to do.

Petersen: I do think it's a much larger conversation that we must have. Is there any other discussion before I call the vote?

Strauss: I think it makes eminent sense to have the new Senate cope with this, rather than this lame-duck Senate. Throw it on their laps. [laughter]

Petersen: All in favor of tabling the recommendations from the Committee on Committees to next fall, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes to table these recommendations for further discussion in the fall.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: We have three calendar items for docketing. And I would like to suggest that we go ahead and docket these in a bundle. We have the Faculty Handbook Consultation which I have already mentioned, and we have two emeritus requests. One emeritus request is for Chris **Edginton** and the second emeritus request is for Carol **Weisenberger**. Is there a motion to docket these items as a bundle for our next meeting? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of docketing the three Calendar Items for April 22nd, please say 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: We have a number of items for consideration today. The first is the Effort Certification and Guidance and Procedure Update. This is a consultation and a bringing us up to speed on the work that this work group has done all year. Jennifer (**Waldron**) and I see Amy **Staples** is with us as well. We did introductions earlier Amy.

Waldron: Thank you. About this time last year, I brought a petition about our Effort Certification Policy that has to do with contracts that run our Research & Sponsored Programs. From that, a working group has been put together and brought back to the Faculty Senate for consultation. On that working group, both Jim (**Mattingly**) and Amy (**Staples**) assisted me in finding faculty. So Amy **Staples** from Special Education, Alex **Oberle**, from Geography and James **Jurgenson** from Biology have all worked together. After, there was a request to look at our Effort Certification Guidance. There was an internal audit done of our policy last summer, and so most of the changes that we have made have been based recommendation from that internal audit. And what we have I think is much cleaner guidance, much less confusing guidance, and a little more clarity in terms of what is expected and why it's expected, and how to go about this particular process. So prior to this, there was just one big page on the RSP (Research & Sponsored Programs) website about Effort Certification. We have broken that into a number of documents. So the first one that is up there is the Effort Certification Responsibilities, and so it has a clear delineation of who is responsible for what in terms of reporting, and then certifying effort that is in concert with Grants & Contracts. We have also—I don't know if you have the other document or if there's other ones—there is the actual procedure for Effort Certification, and so this clearly states what the Effort Certification Reporting Cycle is, and then it has a graphic to assist people, and then it moves into kind of a step-by-step process of how a primary investigator on a grant or contract would go about this particular report. Again, it's more clear, more descriptive, and hopefully able to help people find information more easily. The last document is the actual Guidance, and this

has been broken out into a number of sections, and so there's a clear purpose. We've added information about the financial risk of non-compliance. So there's been a number of institutions who have received pretty significant fines for having errors in accuracies of their Effort Certification. So, through the internal audit process we are asked to add that piece of it. There are definitions that link to this. We were missing some definitions in the past. One being the cost-sharing that occurs. So that is in there. And then we have the actual reporting cycle that occurs at the end, and a section on how to change the upper allocation. So, we've done very significant work in terms of updating these documents. Hopefully, allowing greater ease and understanding of what Effort Certification is, why it's important, and how to go about it here at the University.

Petersen: Are there questions?

Hesse: If I recall correctly, this was Tim **Kidd's** original petition. Is he happy?
(Laughter)

Waldron: So I don't know if he is happy with the actual updates to the guidance and procedures. There was a second piece of what he was--that it's my understanding—what he was discussing, and that has to do with if you receive a summer research fellowship, whether or not in the Faculty Handbook there was a statement that you should be able to use—if you have a grant that is related to the summer research fellowship, you should be able to use the grant to move up to one-ninth's salary. John **Vallentine**, myself, Tolif (**Hunt**) and Michelle **Byers** have created guidance for how to do that, and he is happy about that. [Laughter]

Petersen: So Jennifer (**Waldron**) are these procedures in place now?

Waldron: So we had to respond to the internal audit, so they are up on the website per needing to close out the audit, but we are open to any recommendations or anything that would need to be changed or updated based on this consultation.

Petersen: Are there other questions, comments? Alright. Thank you so much for coming and sharing. The next item on our docket is the Department Head Assessment by Faculty. I have to be careful how I word that. And as I shared in the email, we have the Faculty Evaluation Committee that has been working on our new system of Faculty Evaluation. At the same time that we were beginning these conversations, the Faculty Handbook Committee, which the Faculty Evaluation committee reports to, also felt it important for us to consider how department heads are evaluated. The reasoning being if there's a new system of faculty evaluation, we should have something in place that would be parallel for department heads. So I'm going to turn it over to Becky (**Hawbaker**) to share the work of this committee.

Hawbaker: So this is maybe a third try at a policy here. We had tried it two summers ago, the Faculty Handbook last year took a stab at it, and so this is a third group's [work] with some overlap in the membership. As you can see, we had some really great department heads we were working with: Mary **Connerley**, Eric **Lange**, and a new department head from the College of Ed, Fabio **Fontana**, and then myself, Donna **Huffman**, and Suzy **Friedman**. I tried to give you a little bit of history of some of the past consultation that we've done with this. We made a couple of recommendations: One, and we had lots of discussion about when people become a department head, there's not a lot of really great

guidance or mentorship necessarily that's given to you and what you're supposed to do, and how your job changes from how you were used to working as a faculty member. And so we really thought that a lot of things needed to be updated in the Deans and Director's and Department Head's Handbook. Especially a more elaborated version of how evaluation happens, because we also talked about that the faculty voice in evaluation is not evaluative, it's assessment. It's like the equivalent of student assessments for a faculty member, that they are formative in nature. They are feedback. They should be taken seriously, and that sometimes just as in student assessments, the factual truth of the matter may not be what's most important, but that sometimes perception is reality, right? So we wanted to make clear that this is not evaluation, but it is assessment, and that there is some voice for faculty in giving feedback on the performance of the department head. But we also want to make sure that that whole process is considered across the University, because there's really no standard way that this is handled across colleges and departments, and so we definitely want that to change. In terms of the faculty's role, we had a second recommendation that included some language that might go in the Handbook. I think that for now you can read that and know, and just have an idea of how we meant for this data to be used as formative feedback, but also to for dean's to have a statistical summary of all the responses, and to be able to just like department heads do with their faculty, to make some comparisons across people and to see well, 'Where do I need to devote some mentoring and support?' and 'Who's my rock star that can maybe mentor others?' But I think we've decided that a lot of language about assessment of department head doesn't necessarily belong in a Faculty Handbook. Only a placeholder that preserves the faculty voice and role in the process, and so I think

this is probably going to get shrunk down to just a reference of how this is going to be done, and how changes to it would be handled in the future in a way similar to this: That the faculty leadership would identify some faculty, and the administration would identify administrators. The thing to really look at is the actual instrument itself. So this would be a Likert Scale—sorry for all of the colors, but we wanted to make sure that you knew where some of these changes came from. The yellow highlights were feedback from deans and department heads—although have they seen it again since November, John (**Vallentine**)?

Vallentine: Yes.

Hawbaker: There may be other things, but the yellow highlights—that's from their November feedback. The purple was from—there was also a committee in the College of Education on department head evaluation, and so we asked them for feedback as well. And then the magenta text was the last edit from this committee. And so it's a pretty short, but comprehensive list. We wanted to make sure we covered three key areas of the department head's responsibilities and roles. We were asked to revise some of these, so that they weren't double-barreled. Sometimes to compromise we put two things together, but that's really two different things, so we tried to do that. So, we would like to give this a shot, and I think there are probably some things that could be tightened up with the language, but we also feel like it's in pretty close-enough shape that certainly with feedback from you, and maybe another couple of rounds with the Faculty Handbook and the deans that we can get these in play, so that it is ready to roll out in parallel with the faculty evaluation system.

Zeitz: In the very first lines, it says, “Contributes positively to faculty/staff morale.” Is that the double-barreled thing you were talking about?

Hawbaker: Yes.

Zeitz: So is there another place where it talks about whether they should contribute to staff morale?

Hawbaker: We thought that...this is the faculty voice in the evaluation. We do think that staff should have a role in that; but that’s also part of the larger evaluation process that should be addressed in the Director and the Department Head Handbook maybe.

Zeitz: So that the faculty would evaluate at a different time than the staff would?

Hawbaker: Right. So faculty would complete this. I shouldn’t be asked, “How well does my department head contribute to staff morale?” because I’m not staff. How would I know? Ask the staff.

Zeitz: Good point.

Vallentine: I can circle back to your opening comments Amy (**Petersen**). Two summers ago, there was an administrative group that worked on this process, and then of course the faculty were not involved. Then faculty in the College of Ed were starting on one without administrators, and so when I talked with the Provost at the beginning of the year, it was like “We really need to have a group from both constituencies so, that’s why there were a couple of people from the Handbook Committee on the Faculty side; a couple from the administration side,

and then we added another person. So they have come up with these recommendations. Some of the dialog, as Becky (**Hawbaker**) mentioned is “Where is this going to go?” and I think that’s one of the issues right now with this is for department heads, so we have a Department Head Handbook. It’s just like P & S policies are in P & S and Merit. Merit has their own guidelines or a handbook as well. So we’re looking for the best place for this, but I think everyone’s committed to giving department heads feedback.

Skaar: Are you guys planning on piloting this before it rolls out to all faculty?

Hawbaker: Well I would be interested in that if the administration is willing to pilot the Faculty Evaluation system before it goes into effect. [Laughter] I’m only being partially facetious. I think the first time you do anything it’s a pilot, and as we roll out faculty evaluation, we will encounter things that need to be tightened up. I’m sure that the same thing will happen here, but I do think it’s important that they stay in parallel.

Skaar: I just get worried. As soon as we’re putting numbers on things like a Likert Scale and things like that...and the same can probably be said for the faculty evaluation stuff, that as soon as we start making decisions based on information, is that information reliable and valid? It becomes a question. When you pilot something, generally you’re not making high-stakes decisions on it. I’m an assessment person, so that’s kind of where I’m coming from, and are we making high-stakes decisions based on information that we’re not really sure works yet and people are reading it in the same way? There’s sure a lot of vetting going on with the faculty evaluation piece, although not necessarily a pilot. And I don’t

know if this is going through the same vetting process as the other is. Something to think about and talk about in committee.

Hawbaker: It's been through multiple rounds of vetting, and two previous times to develop this, but I think the important thing is: Are important decisions being made based on this data? No. I think if you scroll back to the process language, this goes to the dean, it goes to the department head. It is not shared with faculty. It is not shared publicly. I guess we will trust the deans to make good use of the data.

Nook: Have we checked to know for sure that this wouldn't be discoverable under a FOIA [Freedom of Information Act] request? They are in Wisconsin.

Hawbaker: Are student assessments also discoverable by FOIA?

Nook: They are in Wisconsin. We should just check. Just so we know. I went ahead with them anyway, but...

Mattingly: There's one item up there "Provides vision for the department." I think that a phrase needs to be added that necessarily involves faculty in that, so "Provides vision for the department in consultation with faculty," for example. Because I would actually find it problematic if a department provided vision for the department unilaterally.

Hawbaker: There is a question about getting input from faculty and staff.

Mattingly: So, you're trying to not be double-barreled?

Hawbaker: Yeah, I hear you.

Hesse: I just want to confirm that all faculty, including adjuncts would be allowed to participate in this evaluation?

Hawbaker: That is my understanding. I guess we didn't address that. We can.

Hesse: I didn't know if a minimum standard had to be met. You have to be half-time or here for three years, or something like that.

Hawbaker: Student assessments are open to all of your students so I guess I would say that this should be open to all of the department head's faculty.

Hesse: I agree.

Petersen: Other questions or comments?

Zeitz: Is there anything that says how often they're evaluated?

Hawbaker: This feedback would be done annually, and we recommended that some more extensive review happen every five years. This is a quick survey. You don't have to fill it out. Right? Just like student assessments. Students don't have to fill it out. You get an email. You choose to fill it out or not. The data—maybe it's garbage in-garbage out. We'll see.

Skaar: If the deans are using it in a more serious way—I don't know if 'serious' is the right word, then we want them to and if it's garbage in, then what happens? That's what I get concerned about.

Hawbaker: We think that having data, and having the opportunity to reflect and to have conversations is the point, and if the data is garbage, then we can talk—

the department head and the dean can talk about that to hopefully make good developmental use of it. Or if we can identify better ways to improve the instrument itself, then that can help too.

Petersen: Any other questions? Alright. Thank you for sharing.

Hawbaker: Thank you and thank you to all of my committee members.

Petersen: The next item on our agenda is Review of the Cancellation Policy 4.07, and we have our students here with us today. I'm so excited because I know it takes a lot of courage to offer a critique of a standing policy, and so I appreciate your work and your advocacy, and you certainly could sit if you wanted to or you could come to the front. Where ever you feel most comfortable.

Gregor: Would it be easier if I sat on that side? Or is it okay here? I'll stay here. So I'm coming in and I want to thank Chair **Petersen** for inviting me. I'm really excited to present to you all, and I want to thank Kristin **Ahart** for her help in developing the policy proposal work that I'm trying to do. I just wanted to come in and give a student perspective on this policy, because I think it's really not working for students, and right now I think UNI can improve it. And with the enrollment issues that we're having right now, I think showing University support for student's concern is vital to the University. So the goal is for this presentation to describe and talk about Policy 4.07 is, the implications on student lives, and I'll ask Tara **Kroymann** to give her own personal impact that she's dealt with, and then solution to the issue. So the policy is, "It is the policy of the University to continue normal hours of operation and maintain a regular work schedule for staff members during periods of severe weather and/or adverse conditions," is

the basic premise of this policy. The University faculty, staff, and students shall have the opportunity to make their own decisions about reporting to work or class with due consideration for travel safety conditions.” It’s my general issue with this policy is the premise that we have the same amount of choice. Basically, I think this policy benefits people who are in positions of privilege, and it oppresses people who are not in those positions. So I have some examples. The issue is that we have these attendance policies that students have to deal with that make it hard for them to be able to not attend class because of the impacts that it may have on their education and their grades. So some examples might be—and these are just pulled from a couple of syllabi that I’ve been collecting. They need to be documented. An issue with documentation is if you have trouble accessing health care, you may not be able to provide the same amount of documentation as another student. Or say, you are a student who doesn’t have access to a car or needs to walk to class or bike to class. That’s going to be a lot more unsafe, especially I think of Polar Vortex time. You can’t bike to class, and so it’s going to be a lot harder for those students to get to class. Or, if you use public transportation and need to wait outside for the bus—these are all major issues.

Gregor: We have another issue of needing to have an excuse and having unexcused absences due to like transportation issues, like I said before. So a lot of these coincide with our severe weather policy, because if you don’t have the money to buy a shovel, you don’t have the money to buy a windshield scraper, you don’t have the money for a car, you break your car—these are all big issues about this policy. Then we see again how often these attendance policies are not flexible for student’s needs. Because most students are not coming to class

because they hate class. Most students aren't coming because they have their own personal issues, and it's not about their education. It's about safety, health, and finance. And so the three issue I see that impact most are financial, health and safety to education. I'd like to invite Tara **Kroymann** to express her impact.

Kroymann: I am impacted in all three of these situations. So, financially a lot of times we are told by our professors to bundle up which is problematic because all of us can't afford to buy new boots, new coats, all of these things that we need to be safe while we're walking to class. So for example, my boots right now are leaking so when I walk in them in snow, my feet get wet which of course that increases the likelihood for frostbite. I don't have the financial means right now to replace them. My coat also does not button up and again, I don't have the finances to replace that. Furthermore, I have a child that I take to daycare. So when UNI does not cancel classes but Waterloo-Cedar Falls does, his daycare is also cancelled. If I'm lucky, I can find a babysitter, but then that costs me money that I don't have. Or if there is a day where nothing is cancelled and I still take him to his daycare I do run the risk of injuring us in car crashes, walking to the car. We've both fallen several times—those kind of things. Health and safety: again that falls within that. Driving to his daycare; walking. I know there was an email sent out to explain that. It explained that they go off of a 15 to 20 minute frostbite timeline. But the walk from the Jennings apartments where I live to Russell Hall or Sabin, which is a common route for me, it takes 30 minutes. So that operates under the assumption of people living in the dorms, when there are a lot more live in Jennings as well.

Then education-wise, like Hannah (**Gregor**) said, a lot of students aren't missing because they hate class. I want to be in class. I don't want to fall behind. With the pacing of these classes, it's very easy to fall behind if you miss just one class. So when I have those situations where my son's daycare is closed and UNI is not, then I'm missing class. I'm losing points for missing class which is going to affect my grade, and I'm falling behind. And often, professors aren't flexible about "Come see me for the notes." You have to find someone else in the class to get those. So, I'm falling behind in my education when I have to miss class, in addition to losing points in my grade for it.

Gregor: I've been speaking to a lot of students about these issues, specifically in February when it was really, really bad if anyone remembers, and so I've collected some information and I'm using initials—they've all given me permission to talk about it, but I don't want to give you their full name. And so a couple of financial impacts is that when students get injured, they have to go see a doctor, and so for example, CD up there fell on the stairs and she had to get an x-ray done because she was afraid she sprained her ankle, which cost \$60 which is at least a week's worth of groceries. Then we had another student who had to go to the hospital after falling near Gilcrest. And then another student that I contacted actually drove her car into a ditch trying to get to class, which is just another way that they're paying tuition. They're paying for their books and fees. They're paying for food. They're paying for an apartment, and now they have a giant car payment because they were trying to get to class. It shows that students really want to come to class because we do value education. We know we're paying for it.

Sometimes it's just not safe, but we do it anyway because we don't have another option because of attendance policies.

Gregor: Health & Safety: A lot of people—I have some Tweets up there and maybe they're not the perfect representation of students, but I think you can see up there that we have someone who sprained their ankle, hurt their wrist, someone falling down the Rialto steps and hitting their head getting concussions. Another one that I want to talk about is the dining staff. You are required to work. So on Polar Vortex Day, students are considered essential staff, and so we—JD up there, he works 20 blocks away from the dining center, and he is required to show up to work and it's Polar Vortex Day, and he would have been fired and could not come to class. So, for a student who doesn't have transportation—that's a big issue. Then the next slide. I want to talk about—I'm not trying to say that the University doesn't do a good job of employing people to shovel and to take care of the roads and such, but sometimes it just doesn't happen, and then we have things like this which creates accessibility issues for students in wheel chairs, for students on crutches; students who have trouble with mobility. Often stairs are the last thing to get shoveled because they're the hardest. I hate shoveling my stairs, but that's another accessibility issue because going up and down stairs through that kind of snow is very difficult, and it's another way that students risk their safety, and this is right by Campbell by the Rialto, so that's a big traffic-way for students.

Gregor: The Educational Impacts, which also coincide with your financial impacts is that you're going to lose points for missing class. One of the major issues for this is that your ability to show up and sit in classroom does not reflect your

knowledge of that subject. Even when professors say, “We need you in class so everyone’s participating and learning,” that’s not fair to students who are risking their health and safety so everyone else can benefit. They should be graded on their ability of the content in the course. And also, low performance in class can lower your grade from losing attendance points, which means less financial aid. So students who are already low income cannot afford coats and jackets and cars may lose their attendance points, doing worse in grades and not getting the financial aid—can’t afford tuition. It’s kind of a snowball effect. And of course if you fail the course because of attendance policies, you have to retake the course, which is another financial loss. And also it may not be a reflection of what you know but a reflection of your physical ability to attend class. And so my major solution for this is that we have the Provost and Executive Vice President may declare a severe weather day where all absences by students must be documented as ‘excused.’ So class would continue as scheduled, and students who feel that they are comfortable enough to attend class can go to class, but if you cannot attend class, there is not repercussions for your ability to attend. Because I know that students—we want to have class. Students in the dorms can often make it class, and we should allow them to go to class because they’re paying a lot of money for it. But I don’t think we should not be coercing students into going to class on severe weather days, as the policy establishes. And I just wanted to show that we actually have a precedent for this kind of idea. Under the University policy for attendance: You are required to excuse absences related to the military, if you are in childbirth, or if you have jury duty, or a legal matter to attend to. So I think this proposal is not radical by any means. We’ve already seen it done by the University. We just need to accept that maybe students—we need

to—the faculty and staff need to be aware of the student’s difficulties that this policy creates. So if you want to open up to questions, that’s all I got.

Petersen: Let me just premise our discussion I think we have the option, if we choose to take up this issue, we could refer it to EPC, the Educational Policy Committee, and they could potentially take on—I think there are a few potential ideas here for revision, and the EPC could do that and then return it back to the Senate if we are so inclined. We certainly can have some discussion, and if there is a motion to take this up and refer it to the EPC, then we can also vote.

Gregor: One more thing I just remembered: Kristin **Ahart** and I did go to NISG about getting their support in this policy proposal, so you’re [refers to **Ahart**] meeting with the committee...

Ahart: Campus Relations Committee.

Gregor: And then we’re trying to put the proposal through NISG. So there’s really student support for this as well. This is not just me getting on a soapbox. This—all students are feeling upset.

Burnight: I just want to make sure I understand. The policy change--the meat of this is essentially that a part from closing the University, the Provost would then have the option to trump all individual policies about attendance and say, “You can’t call this an unexcused absence without this step.” That is the central point of this, correct?

Gregor: Right.

Burnight: Thank you.

Zeit: I think I'm not talking about policy itself, but I think there's some things that we could also do. In our Ed Tech and Design class, we do require attendance. But we also have—they earn 800 points over the period of a semester, and we have an extra credit option. So if there's something—if you missed out on things, then there's something else you can do and get additional credit to make up for those points. Now, that's one option, and I do understand that what it is is making the people who were affected by that work a little bit harder. I'm just saying it's an option. Another thing is, I teach a lot of online classes, and I record all of my classes. And I have students who are parents and they've got to go see a concert or they're doing parent-teacher conferences because these are working teacher—that sort of thing. And so I record all of my classes and expect them to watch them. Those teachers who want to put the screws to them, they can also make it so that you can see whether a certain person has watched that video to see if that would count. Something like that could count for attendance as well. Obviously, I'm saying that I'm doing it online, but there are programs and things like that, that all the teacher would have to do is turn it on their computer and they end up with a recording and they're set. So I think there are some other ways in which we could approach it or ways we could augment solving the problem or addressing it.

Petersen: I do wonder because I appreciate those ideas, and I think they are incredibly viable, but I also wonder if every professor has the means or the interest. If we could require such a thing from every professor, whereas if we were to revise the policy, it seems like that might be a quicker fix if you will.

Zeitz: I'm just saying that this would be over and above. I'm just saying that it would be another way to approach it. Because even if it's approved, and it's okay for you not to be there, you've still lost out. You might be able to get notes from your partners and that sort of thing, but if you can listen to the interaction—you won't be part of the discussion, but you can watch it.

Gregor: I agree completely. I would encourage professors to put more of their content online and available for students in that arena. I think it's a great additional proposal that I didn't put it in here because I'm not going to make the policy.

Gould: Did you talk to the Provost about this?

Ahart: Would you like us to elaborate? I briefly just briefly in passing spoke to him after Faculty Senate one day about what the best way to go about making change in this would be. The possibilities would be with the EPC, but we wanted to see what student government could do; and the best avenue to support him, to support our fellow students—to best present that to the faculty in an effective manner, and so he suggested that we come forward with a resolution on behalf of Student Government, as well as partnering with our concerned students and advocating to you all for the changes that we need as students to best further our learning; our education. He's in the loop. He understands what students have been doing kind of behind the scenes along the way.

Gould: Okay.

Hawbaker: I just wonder if—I don't think you mean this is to be a replacement for like a cancellation policy, that there should be times where this is too bad, no one should try to do this. But I worry that even though that's not the intent, that giving that middle ground when it's a tough call, that there will be more of those times where maybe a faculty member is then left in this situation where they're not sure--if they're putting their own safety on the line, they're putting their own students--they have to make a call and decide whether to move forward with class or not, and anytime you have all of that decision dispersed across hundreds and hundreds of faculty members, I don't know that that's the best thing either, so I like that there's a middle ground. That there's something where students are held harmless from the impact, but I'm just thinking through to the next steps and how that might play out for faculty.

Gregor: Right. And I worry about staff as well. There's a lot of coercion involved with essential staff having to go as well.

Stollenwerk: Everything that you said about Waterloo shuts down school—I'm trying to walk through the steps. That's all stuff that we also—we're totally there with you. I don't know how other people do it. I don't take attendance, and if someone sends me an email in advance, I'll save all my notes, staple them together and then give it to the student. They're not always the most legible, but it's there for them. At the same time, you don't want to...don't people who work at John Deere, like what do they do with their children too? So I wonder what do we do to solve this problem?

Gregor: One thing I think about a lot is that people are paid to go to work. Students are paying to go to class, which is very different.

Cutter: I think you brought up a number of really important issues, and I think that probably the further conversation about this has to be not just one solution, but a number of solutions. For example, your issues with coats and boots. That's awful. But that's going to be a problem on other cold days. Maybe we should—I know there's more interest in food banks for students. Maybe we should work on that as an issue as well, because that's going to be a problem all winter, even on fine weather days. That's something as a University we should really think about. Then there's the issue of cleaning of campus, like those pictures of the steps and all, and some days where the whole place was like an ice skating rink. It's not safe for anybody to be walking on those days. So something needs to go there. The story about the students who are essential staff, who even if campus is closed still have to show up. That's another issue that we should definitely address as well.

Nook: That's the first I've heard of that, by the way. That there are students who are considered essential staff.

Wolfe: The IT department as well are considered essential staff.

Nook: Yeah.

Wolfe: It's all the Rialto and the Piazza.

Nook: When you mentioned Rialto and Piazza, I understand what they're doing, but classifying them as essential staff...

Stollenwerk: I just wanted to put out one last thought. We're not a hospital. Is anybody going to die if we don't show up? Honestly. Is it worth it?

Nook: There are some essential staff that have to be here. We have to keep the boilers running. We have to keep the heat going. There's a few other things that have to keep going, so we do have a set of very essential staff that we have to have someone show up for. And even some of those end up trading shifts and working double shifts because someone else can't get in, depending on exactly what's going on. All of the people that are clearing the sidewalks and things are considered essential staff if the buildings are going to be open. So there is a set. It's a little different than a hospital, but there is a set of people that we've got to have come in.

Skaar: Thinking about other ways of addressing this, those you make a very good point about the fact that your grade isn't based on your attendance, and it's based on your knowledge of the content skills that you're learning in that class, and so I'm just wondering if there's a way that we can continue to have that conversation with faculty through the CETL, through the course that new faculty take, and how we assess and how we grade and some of those kinds of things. Thinking about different ways to grade and what grades really mean, and some of those philosophical, pedagogical kinds of things that I think we as a faculty could talk about through different means of education and professional development.

Petersen: I'm hearing lots of good ideas which causes me to wonder that perhaps we might wish to table this and start the discussion in the fall before the snow

flies again. We could also if we have an interest send it to the EPC to take a look a look at revising some of the policy to bring back to us.

Strauss: Since it still seems to be going through process with NISG and there's more interaction that's going to occur, we probably should wait before we send it to EPC so I make a motion again to table this.

Stafford: Didn't all three of you say you were seniors?

Wolfe, Gregor, Kroymann: Yes.

Stafford: That might present a difficulty for this committee in that they won't be here and they would have to find other people to take up their charge and communicate down all of that they discussed within their committee. I just want to make sure that's recognized.

Ahart: I'd like to note that I am a member of the EPC, so were it to move on, I could serve as a liaison between NISG and what we are currently working on, and the conversations happening here as well as the Education Policy Committee if that's of a concern. We do have a voice there.

Mattingly: Will you be on the EPC next year, Kristin (**Ahart**)?

Ahart: I am graduating in May, so I will not be on the EPC committee next fall.

Zeitz: Are we in the discussion mode now? Is there a motion that hasn't been seconded and then we discuss?

Petersen: If we desire to table the motion, then we can have discussion around if we should table it or not.

Strauss: There was no opportunity for anybody to second it before.

Petersen: Senator **Strauss** has made a motion that we table this discussion until the fall. Is there a second? So that motion is dead. Is there a motion to move this conversation to the EPC? Senator **Burnight**. Senator **Skaar**, second. Discussion around giving this proposal to the EPC to consider for possible revision, which would mean they would then bring it back to the Senate and we could have additional discussion.

Mattingly: Would the EPC be able to put it on their agenda for this year? Do you know?

Petersen: I think our next meeting--We do have another meeting. [Checking calendars]

Zeitz: While she's doing that, the important aspect is that if we wait until the fall, then the snows are going to come and that sort of thing, and we won't be able to address this necessarily. I think that if we can take it over to the EPC right now, put into their laps. Maybe they'd feel it's important enough to have a summer meeting—put it so it can be acted upon rather than waiting.

Ahart: We don't have a meeting scheduled yet for April.

Petersen: I think we will, but I can connect with Chris (**Neuhaus**) and see if we could shift this to the top of that docket. I think there might be two policies that

we would be looking at potentially that could be revised that would meet what you are proposing. Any other discussion on this? The motion on the floor is that we as a Senate charge the EPC with looking at this proposal and potentially doing some revisions. All in favor of doing that, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes and I will connect with Chris (**Neuhaus**) to see if we can move it to the top of the docket.

Nook: Can I ask one thing of the committee? As you're doing this, one of the things that's nice about the current policy is it does lay out a really clear demarcation in when we should cancel classes for cold weather—not necessarily snow, but cold. It goes back to this 15-minute wind chill or frostbite that they mentioned. You're going to ask for a—what was the name of it--severe weather. Think a little bit, at least some guidance on when that might be called. Right? The nice thing about our current policy is even as Provosts switch, right—it stays in place. Our current provost has spent most of his life in southern Florida. [Laughter] Your current president is his first job in a state that doesn't border Canada. And there could be some real differences in the way we would call classes if we didn't have this. I think with this policy in particular because it has huge implications for faculty and the way they're going to teach their classes, having some discussion about what the demarcation between, "Hey, we're open," and "Hey, we're open, but," would be helpful.

Petersen: Thank you.

Nook: Thank you.

Petersen: The next item on our agenda is the recommendation from the Committee on Committees to discharge the Writing Committee. As you recall, we had members of the Writing Committee, including David **Grant** here two weeks ago to share a bit about the charge of the Writing Committee to provide some historical context, and now we have a request to discharge this committee. So let me first ask if there is a motion, and if we approve the motion, then we can open it up for some additional discussion before we take a vote. Is there a motion to discharge the Writing Committee?

Strauss: Discharge means eliminate?

Petersen: Yes.

Strauss: So moved.

Petersen: As a Faculty Senate Committee.

Strauss: Then what will it be?

Petersen: Well, part of the Writing Committee Report, there included recommendations for other avenues for the Writing Committee's work might exist or be embedded or integrated. Two weeks ago, and I know you were not at the Senate meeting, we discussed perhaps what linkages there might be to the General Education Revision Committee, and how the Writing Committee's work might be embedded into that next conversation that the GERC will have about structure.

Strauss: Is that up to us to embed it?

Petersen: No.

Strauss: Are we just going to discharge it as a Senate Committee?

Petersen: Yes, but you were asking me what other possibilities might exist for the work. So there is a motion. Is there a second to discharge the Writing Committee? Seconded by Senator **Hesse**. Additional discussion around this issue?

Hawbaker: Can I ask if there's been any movement on moving the Committee's work to other groups, other areas, other endeavors, especially the Gen Ed Revision?

Grant: Would you like me to speak on that? I know that the NISG Senators did rally and heard our discussion, and it was fairly loosely worded proposal, but they did pass a proposal last Wednesday evening in support of the student voices that—in support of something. Right? And not just this leaping into “We don't know what.” Right? So the student voices have—NISG—has said that they wanted something—something more concrete. So this did generally support the Committee. I do know too that there have been some job descriptions handed down in the Academic Learning Center that are pointing to maybe there might be some more faculty. Not sure where that comes from, or how that happens, or exactly what kind of expertise goes along with that. Beyond that, all I can say is that after our meeting two weeks ago, I also did run into Senator **O'Kane**. He's not here today, and he's on the General Education Review Committee, and he told me he really advocates for the University Writing Committee members to come back to the General Ed Revision Committee and really, ‘Let's talk this through,’ for an entire meeting at least. That's his position. So I know there's a concern. But again, are we going to jump into the dark and hope or what? Right? I think as I've

talked to Jim **Mattingly** throughout this whole process, this is a legitimate question for you guys. I can't answer it. All I can do is say, "This is what we hope." This is what we would want—what we are trying to do support all of our students and even to support you in teaching all of the students. But it's ultimately your call.

Mattingly: There seems to be a lot of question about "Well, what's next?" and I think the answer so far is that we don't know for sure what's next, but we have some clues. Right? One regards the General Education Revision Committee, but another very important initiative that's going on on campus that I think ultimately is where the answer lies, is the committee on—it's an hoc working group on Interdisciplinary Study on campus, and that group's charge is to figure out how we structure these kinds of cross-curricular, co-curricular kinds of activities that would avoid the kind of frustration that the Writing Committee has had in being attached to the Senate. Right? So I think the answer ultimately is there, with the Interdisciplinary working group.

Grant: And I'll say too, since I'm also on that committee—The Interdisciplinary Committee—we haven't really talked about co-curricular, but it really is the conversations in that Committee have been really about the structure. Do we have formal structure that can bring these endeavors; bring two or more departments, or what we're calling units—program units—can we bring two or more together? Is there a physical, actual structure to support that? Because that's where sustainability and other issues get lost in the mix. So maybe, Jim (**Mattingly**). I don't know.

Mattingly: If it's going to be solved, that's where it would be solved. Not here.

Hesse: My position is that the current system isn't working, and this was pointed out in the Writing Committee's own report. Initially they wanted to detach themselves from the Senate, and then attach themselves to the Provost's Office, and that didn't work out. And so it's unclear where they're going but it just doesn't seem that this...This committee has been attached to the Senate for a decade I think and the current system isn't working right, so I do think we need to try something else, keeping in mind that whatever we propose is not permanent. It can change, too.

Hawbaker: I'd feel better if there was an alternative that we're moving to because I worry that it will just get lost. Earlier in the meeting we were talking about the difficulty of getting faculty to serve on things and in this case we have the opposite problem. We have passionate faculty with good expertise who have poured their passions into something that has come to nothing. I want to make sure that their work and expertise is directed in a productive way.

Petersen: I do worry, that to keep them as a Senate Committee without a charge that it might result in another decade of work that is good quality work, but is not having the impact that the Committee would hope for.

Koch: It is kind of ironic that we use writing in all of the...writing is part of our basic communication skills, and yet there's no committee that could survive after this vote, but because writing is a basic component of the LAC, and it seems like it will be part of the next formulation of the LAC, that maybe something kind of organic could rise up from the ashes of the demise of this one.

Petersen: Just speaking of the Interdisciplinary Committee, that is a Senate Committee, so we could revise that charge to include this as an issue for them to take on as part of their work--investigating the interdisciplinary structures and trying to understand and construct those structures.

Hawbaker: But as a committee of the Senate, it will have the same limitations that the Committee on Writing had.

Petersen: That is correct. I do think that Interdisciplinary Committee very soon will need to interconnect with the General Education Revision Committee.

Hawbaker: That's the connection that I am more interested in.

Zeitz: What was it about the Writing Committee that wasn't working? Somebody said that the way it's set up right now—at least from what I heard, that it wasn't working. What wasn't working?

Mattingly: What isn't working was spelled out in the Committee's report last fall, but the basic idea is that they haven't made progress in having writing across the curriculum established in curricular programs. In other words, as a Faculty Senate Committee, because the Faculty Senate doesn't create curriculum, they have no entry point into the curriculum being a Faculty Senate Committee.

Zeitz: So we're saying we move it into a different arena, then they can actually work on developing curriculum? They have the same problem in K-12. It's nice to say that the people in Biology will learn how to write in a biological way, but then

the biology teachers don't want to teach writing, which is probably the same problem we're going to run into throughout the campus.

Mattingly: What I'm not saying though is we would decide where this committee finds an entry point into the curriculum, because that's not the Faculty Senate's purview.

Zeitz: Right. I understand.

Petersen: Alright. So we have a motion on the floor. I'm going to go ahead and call the vote. All in favor of discharging the Writing Committee, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed? Two [three] opposed, Senator **Stafford**, Senator **Stollenwerk**, and Senator **Zeitz**. Did I? Any abstentions? Senator **Smith** is an abstention. So now I have to do the math. I think the motion passed. Thank you. The last item on our agenda today is the Emeritus Request for Mary **Christ**.

Petersen: Mary **Christ** is a Department Head and Associate Professor in the Department of Accounting, and I do have a letter on her behalf:

"Mary **Christ** has over thirty years of credible service in higher education, including twelve years at UNI. Mary's research focus has been on auditor expertise, student learning, and learning assurance. She has presented her work at national and international conferences and has published in numerous outlets, including the top ranked Accounting Review and publications of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International). During her career, she has won awards for both teaching and service. While at UNI, Mary has taught courses at the undergraduate, Master of Accounting, and MBA level. She has taught internationally in the UNI MBA programs in Hong Kong and Shanghai, as well at the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics in Moscow and the University of Economics in Katowice,

Poland. Since Fall 2012, Mary has been Director of the Master of Accounting program. From 2012 to 2014, she was the John Deere Faculty Scholar. Since Fall 2014, she has served as Head of the Department of Accounting and the Halverson Professor of Accounting, a title she still holds. Since 2012 she has served as the Head of the Department of Accounting. As a member of the college's leadership team, she has been instrumental in strategically advancing both the department as well as the college.”

Petersen: Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Request for Mary **Christ**?

Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Is there anyone else who would like to speak on her behalf or make any comments? All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Mary **Christ**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions. The motion passes. Thank you. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. We missed you two weeks ago.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614